Meet and Confer Minute – October 2013

Faculty,

On October 8, the proposed meet and confer issues list with issues from the faculty and issues from the administration was posted to the Faculty Association website. That same day, the Faculty Excecutive Council was briefed on the issues identified by the administration. All residential faculty were e-mailed an invitation to provide feedback on the issues identified by the adminstration through an online survey. Feedback on the issues identified by faculty was not sought at this time because the priortized list of faculty issues had already been determined by faculty senates and the Faculty Executive Council. It was apparent from the comments that some faculty did not understand that the issues list provided in the survey included only the issues identified by the adminstration.

There were 210 faculty (15% of residential faculty) who responded to the online survey resulting in 120 pages of feedback for the Faculty Meet and Confer Team. Representative feedback on the diverse viewpoints is attached. For every issue, there were faculty in favor of negotiating the issue and faculty opposed to negotiating the issue this negotiation year.

During the October 21 Meet and Confer Team meeting, the faculty and the administration discussed the 12 issues brought forward for consideration this year. Each team member identified the six issues that they believed were of greatest importance to their constituents. The issues receiving the most votes from the eight members of the Meet and Confer Team were determined to be the highest priority issues. A joint communique identifying the issues which were selected by the Meet and Confer Team will be sent to the Governing Board, CEC, FEC, and faculty in the next couple of days. The communique will also be posted to the Faculty Association website.

Faculty will be kept informed of the progress on each of the issues through monthly Meet and Confer Minute communications and frequent discussions at Faculty Executive Council meetings. Faculty are encouraged to dialogue with their Faculty Senate Presidents to provide input throughout the year. During April 2014, the Faculty Association leadership and members of the Faculty Meet and Confer Team will visit each of the colleges for a face-to-face dialogue related to the issues and negotiated solutions.

Best,
Frank Wilson
Meet and Confer Team Co-Chair

Inversion Salary inversion occurs when new employees are paid more than comparably qualified existing employees. MCCCD salary placement policy and salary advancement practices have resulted in salary inversion for hundreds of residential faculty. Many of the affected faculty fill important leadership roles at their colleges and are actively involved in hiring and mentoring fellow faculty. Can we create a plan to address inversion issues? What feedback do you have on this issue?

Response Count

174

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
7	This is the single biggest problem in Maricopa. We need to shift employees negatively impacted by the inversion to the appropriate place on the Salary Schedule. We should be paid fairly for the same years of experience as those hired externally. If the inversion is not corrected, then it makes working outside of Maricopa more valuable than teaching in Maricopa.	15	This should not be an issue. The deal was good enough to take when faculty was hired so it should be good enough now. The fact that someone else got a better deal should have no more to do with this than if someone hired later got a lesser deal. Test: If Maricopa new hires were now paid less should previously hired faculty take a pay cut? If no then this is not an issue.
24	The salary inversion issue is the main issue causing me to start looking elsewhere for employment. It is very difficult to stay excited and interested in staying, when I have been here for over 7 years yet I make way less than my colleagues who have less experience and qualifications. It is a factor that will cause experienced faculty to become frustrated and leave, which is a disservice to our students.	53	While I am negatively affected by this, I think that we have all become unheathily fixated upon the issue. I agreed to my salary placement when I was hired. Do I get to renegotiate that every time a change in hiring practices takes place? When did we decide that everyone needs to get paid exactly the same, based only on years teaching and degree status? Interesting that you note that many affected faculty (like me) serve in leadership roles (like me), but there's no talk of any merit-based pay increases, just cries of some infantile notion of "fairness" that really isn't fair, anyway.
146	This should be the top priority this year. This issue demoralizes many very outstanding faculty; it needs to be redressed immediately.	102	This should be very low on the priority list. People need to stop whining about it.
111	This is clearly a big issue that, as I understand it, is an "unintended consequence" as a result of dealing with some earlier issues. That said, the salary inversion is not only unfair it is one of the biggest disincentives for new faculty to become fully engaged in the life of our colleges. Yes, I believe a plan can and must be created. To me, this should be our top priority as it is demoralizing the faculty and has very real, very concrete effects. Simply, can we not bring the faculty, those who have not received any raises since being hired during the economic "meltdown" period, up to speed? Just pay the folks.	150	The people who are effect by inversion are very vocal. All groups of people are effected by steps and raise issues. Perhaps, new hires should not be hired at elevated levels. This would make new hires more inline with current employees. Don't do anything about inversion... It is what it is. I dropped out of the Maricopa Union because this issue was on top of the list. My concerns were not being addressed.

RIF Policy and Procedures How can we modify the current RIF language to allow the district and its colleges the needed flexibility as staffing patterns and student demand on campus and in programs change? What feedback do you have on this issue?

	Response Count
	120

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
43	This is definitely needed. Perhaps (some of) the fear/resistance could be mitigated if there was some sort of retirement inducement as part of this. Might provide a window of flexibility, though not longer-term flexibility.	2	The language stated in the RFP is adequate.
70	The RIF policy is convoluted and outdated. It needs to be simplified. There should just specific identifiable characteristics that can be documented before RIF occurs.	88	I think that our faculty representatives should help faculty to keep our jobs! I don't think it is in the best interest of the faculty to make it easier for administrators to eliminate the jobs of residential faculty. This is a slippery slope! In a few years we could see the entire Maricopa Faculty Association eliminated. If you only need one full-time faculty member in each discipline at Rio Salado, why would you need more than one at any other college? Then, if you only have one residential faculty member in each discipline at every college, why not just consolidate everything under Rio Salado? We have seen the prior GateWay Administration base their decisions on a "Reduction in Force" on purely political factors--not based on student needs, volume, program cost or any other rational factor. Why would you expect a different result from administration in the future?
97	Make it workable. The current policy is too cumbersome and prescriptive.	108	What is the RIF policy for ADMINISTRATORS? What are the threats to THEIR existence? Why on Earth is this an issue when they haven't even come close to meeting the 60/40 ratio?

Inconsistent Pay Rates for Extra Duty Can we arrive at consistent pay rates for extra duty (e.g. instructional/service designation)? (RFP Appendix C) What feedback do you have on this issue?

	Response Count
	115

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
64	The pay rate for extra duty should be equal for service and instructional faculty.	4	The pay rates should reflect the difficulty of the work being performed. Not all work should necessarily pay the same.
84	The disparity in extra duty pay between instructional and service faculties has been a rift between these two cohorts since it began. Further, compensating faculty at the rate of $27 an hour is insulting. Raise all faculty pay to the same level.	8	Since extra duties are not the same, the current pay rates in Appendix C are fine.
91	Arriving at a consistent pay rate would mean that the time spent outside of the classroom by faculty is valued the same. It would eliminate the misconception that one type of faculty's time is more valuable than another's.	58	There is a rationale for the inconsistency; the higher rate service faculty extra duty is for providing the "same primary roles" that they were hired for, but outside of accountability (serving as Counselor or Librarian during the evening and/or beyond the contract year). Instructional faculty extra duty is "outside their primary role" of teaching (example: chairing a committee). When service faculty serve outside their primary role they are paid the lower rate as well.
102	Faculty are faculty. The distinction needs to be abandoned. We all facilitate learning just some, like library faculty, do not necessarily do this in classrooms. There is also a great gap between summer compensation between the two faculty classes.	68	I just read that section from end to end and it is a very complicated and drawn out section. It looks to me like it has been cobbled together piece by piece for many years. Although I think it needs to be gutted and reevaluated i think that it is a waste of time to proceed with that. No one is going to want "their" section changed. I vote to spend time on issues like salary inversion and the MFA issue.

Reassign time and the issues regarding consistency Can we address the inconsistencies in Appendix C related to compensation and reassigned time? What feedback do you have on this issue?

	Response Count
	98

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
1	YES!!!!!!!!!!! Instead of a "flat rate", it needs to be representative of the position, role, responsibilities & workload!!!!	5	Appendix C is fine and has worked for years. Don't mess with it.
37	We need to create a standardized rate for extra duty pay.	19	I have no problem with the pay differentials in Appendix C, unless the pay is raised for these duties.
40	Reassign time in the RFP is a minimal suggestion, anyway. It would be good to have consistency, and also accountability for that reassign time -- expected duties for instance.	32	current language
64	If inconsistent - fix it The inconsistency is a result of administration trying to not pay people for work	86	leave as is

Evening/Weekend/Summer Supervision What should be the standards and expectations for evening/weekend/summer supervision? What feedback do you have on this issue?

	Response Count
	107

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
12	They actually have to be present during their supervision times. Some basic training in duties should also be expected.	32	We should continue with the same standards as we have now. The fact that this is an administrative issue shows us that the administrators who brought this about have no understanding of what it means to be a faculty supervisor and are out of touch with what goes on at the colleges. And if they are in touch with their colleges and asking this question, perhaps they are not doing their job. In either case, this is not an issue of importance to the faculty and it should be ignored.
23	My personal observation is that individuals who are being paid to do this supervision actually do very little. Whatever the standards and expectations are, they should be clearly delineated with specific duties that must be completed. Supervisors should be completing written evaluations as part of their duties and all adjunct faculty should be evaluated on a regular basis (once a year or once a semester). (All residential faculty should also be regularly evaluated, but that's another topic.)	34	Are these standards and expectations not already spelled out in the RFP? I see no need for a change. If someone is not doing what they are supposed to be doing, deal with those individuals.
54	I feel like there should be just as much attention paid to students who take classes in the evening, summer and on the weekends. There should be a accountability for those times just as we see during the day. The world does not stop working just because it is after five and a weekend.	50	Why would these need to change? I don't believe they need to change.
60	Wow, this really needs to occur. Someone must be part of the chain of command in large organizations. Students esp. on line access do not see their learning occurring M - F, from 8 to 5.	95	the RFP is clear already
75	I think it is reasonable for Administration to expect a supervisor to be present during the time s/he is supervising. I would consider this an easy "give" to the Admin M&C team.	103	What are the problems with this to begin with? Not sure they are being real transparent here. If they want to have a supervisor on site at all times (which is what they want) then just say it. The standards/expectations now work well and have not been abused. This is not a priority, it is simply the administration wanting to get more out of our already taxed and inverted faculty.

Defining the role/responsibilities/on-campus presence for faculty What should be the expectations and responsibilities of faculty? What feedback do you have on this issue?

	Response Count
	135

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
13	Consistency would appreciated. There seems to differences not only between division, but sometimes even within the division. Most understand the 30 hour expectation, but some divisions are allowed to 'work from home' or have 'online office hours' or even the idea of if the 30 hours are in (Monday - Thursday) Fridays are optional. Clarity, consistency are important.	9	These are already outlined clearly in the RFP. No need for a change.
16	Their should be some firm expectations set. Many faculty want to get away with the bare minimum, teach their class and leave. In our department, there is no consequences for missing departmental meetings. Those should be mandatory, along with office hours and committee service. The definition of committee service needs to be broad to include many different ways a faculty member may serve the college or community.	28	Stay away from this. Different people have different ways of getting their job done. Some faculty like to work on campus, while others are more productive off campus. Some days I'm on campus for 12 hours while others I'm only here for 5 or so. One of the nice things about being a faculty member is this flexibility. As long as I teach my classes and hold my office hour each day, where I do the rest of my work should not be prescribed in the RFP. Again, leave this alone.
55	I believe faculty should make themselves available in person for their students. Too many faculty don't spend enough time on campus.	96	The responsibilities for faculty are in terms of duties, not in terms of time and presence. We should begin to acknowledge the fact that not all work is accomplished at a desk and that the workload for faculty is defined by what they do and not where they are.
105	On the one hand I am concerned with the seeming absence of many faculty on campus (other than attending their classes). For example at many committee meetings I attend there are certain faculty that are never present. However I think it is also important that we don't move to a "punch clock" mentality regarding faculty. It is also important that we find a way to be consistent across all faculty groups. For example it seems that many faculty have carte blanche to come and go as they please on campus with no accountability other than office hours and class meeting times, but other faculty are locked down to a specific 7.5 hour schedule.	128	Not necessary. Language already exists in the RFP. Need an administration strong enough to hold people accountable and not be afraid to address issues that arise.
116	I actually support this issue. I work with far too many online faculty who actually take week-long vacations in the middle of the semester, just because they "can." They give their online students assignments, answer a few emails from the cruise ship, and call it a day. Of course, the RFP does address many of these issues, but because the RFP isn't enforced, some faculty disregard the policies.	132	Physically being on campus is not the only element required for quality instruction and service to the college / district. Please do not create a "one size fits all" solution to a problem that doesn't exist. Faculty are not administrators who actually should be on campus in order to perform their job duties.

Appointive Faculty Evaluation The movement to probationary faculty evaluation is laudable. How can we incorporate a more robust faculty evaluation process for all appointive faculty? What feedback do you have on this issue?

	Response Count
	147

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
7	Apply the same model to appointive faculty, but have them do it only once every 3 years.	6	We don't need a new one. The FEP process is good and would work if everyone took it seriously. Simply publish FEPs so everyone sees what appointive faculy are doing.
14	Although it might be unpopular, I see no reason that the new evaluation process can't be extended to appointive faculty. Just because we have achieved appointive status does not give us the right to stop evaluating how we are doing things.	18	Who says this is "laudable"? PAR is not a good idea for probationary or appointive faculty. The current process is "robust" enough. I learned a lot, further developed my skills, documented my professional growth, and work with colleagues/mentors a great deal as probationary faculty and continue to do so. Where is the evidence that says the current process isn't working?
36	I am supportive of a plan that puts greater value on residential faculty and what they do. I can understand how some might believe that residential faculty are just highly paid adjunct (see #6 above). A fair, challenging, supportive, collaborative process to evaluate faculty should not be something we fear but something we embrace!	37	Our current system works fine. There is no need to change this. If the FA does go along with the administration on this, then it will have betrayed the faculty.
45	I believe the current process is a joke and doesn't capture what is intended. But please don't make this so difficult for the evaluator that it becomes cumbersome and extremely time consuming.	47	I believe the current faculty evaluation process is "robust".
81	In order to protect tenure, it is useful/desirable to have a documented way in which Faculty can show how they hold each other accountable for consistent professional excellence. A flexible set of criteria - based on long scholarly practice in the Academy - that Faculty are expected to meet and maintain over their career in order to stay current in their field, provide exemplary instruction and student support, and further the larger missions of their College and District (consistent and documentable committee and task force service, etc.) would be desirable SO LONG AS this process is Faculty-initiated, Faculty-driven, and Faculty-maintained.	72	Probably the most problematic point in the entire proposal. This is definitely not negotiable. THE FA needs to stay strong and dismiss any threats by administration to manage by exception. You had 5 years to get rid of a faculty that was problematic. Do not make changes to this, the FA will suffer and its members will be strongly disappointed in the FA leadership. What is the point? Why does administration need to supervise us? Don't they have anything to do? The politics that are a plague at higher institutions for tenure will begin to play out on our campuses and destroy departments that are weak. I almost foresee a large number of lawsuits due to undue process and "dislike" or "racial" "hostile environment" issues from chairs to employees. I think this one needs to be stopped now.

OYOs Can we revisit the OYO/OSO language in the RFP? What feedback do you have on this issue?

	Response Count
	99

Support Pursuing Issue		Do Not Support Pursuing Issue	
44	I think this language needs to be revisited.	2	The language is adequate.
50	Yes, and don't include them as part of 60/40	5	Why? The new 60/40 issue and how colleges use OYOs was agreed on last year. Using OYOs for years is destructive to good hiring practices. We invest too much in training extended OYOs and then have to do it all over again with the newly hired probationary faculty. The old three-year policy was abused by administrations. Don't go backwards. We NEED to hire the BEST when staffing committees approve a hire, not try to save money for a couple years only to spend more on time and effort in training and ending up with two and three OYOs in a department until some deadline forces us to hire more than the best candidate in a year and have to hire the two or three best out of a single late pool.
36	There may be some clarification needed -- the experimental program language is pretty restrictive -- new program with no res. faculty. What about growth of a program? Could that also be allowed, but on a time-limited basis?	23	OYO usage was codified last year. Why is there a need to revisit now?
62	The manner in which we treat OYO/OSO faculty is creating a "sub-class" of faculty in the district. We hire them through the same process, give them almost identical responsibilities as residential faculty members, but compensate them at a lower (capped) rate, and stop their benefits every summer, even if they are retained for multiple years. They often do not even get credit for years of service when they are hired because we are "capping" the number of years we give new hires. The manner in which the OYO/OSO policy has been implemented at many campuses is inappropriate, unfair, and an abuse of the current system. I understand the need to use these positions to replace those out on medical leave or sabbatical. However, using them to replace a retiree, or fill a new position, is ridiculo us. Counting them as part of the 60-40 ratio is also inappropriate. If this language is addressed it should be to compensate these people appropriately, and provide some protections against the current unethical implementation of the policy on the part of administration.	56	I am in favor of maintaining current language - perhaps with clarifying language - that limits OYO/OSO usage to its original intent - to support NEW programs while they get off the ground, AND to provide relief in situations where the hiring is "off-cycle" or in too short a time-frame to allow for a robust pool and hiring process to take place. Multi-year OYOs simply for budgetary reasons should NOT be allowed to continue. This creates a systematic underclass within full-time instruction that is extremely undesirable.

Do you have any additional feedback that you would like to provide the Faculty Meet and Confer Team?

	Response Count
	137

	Postive Comments about the Faculty Meet and Confer Team		Criticisms of the Faculty Meet and Confer Team
23	The Faculty Meet and Confer Team do an amazing job for very little thanks. I deeply appreciate you working with the administrative team to support and encourage faculty and our professionalism.	34	Don't sell out the faculty. Represent the faculty and don't be advocates for the administration.
33	I support you! Thank you for your efforts! Don't listen to those that always have negative things to say.	36	Your questions were ambiguous at best and next to impossible for feedback purposes. Perhaps you really weren't interested in receiving feedback at all.
80	This year's regular and detailed communications on each stage of the process is a model that should continued to be followed in future years. Announcing broadly the full sets of issues put forward and then those that have been decided to be worked by the joint team as soon as those lists have been compiled is THE best way to do this in the future. It prevents "surprises" at the end of the year when no meaningful use can be made of broad feedback from the various stakeholders.	97	Consider working for the improvement of education instead of strengthening the dictatorship of the administration.
107	Thank you all for all of the hard work you are doing. I don't envy you your task and I appreciate the opportunity to have input!!	114	I want you to know that it is my belief, and the belief of many others, that the reason salary inversion was tabled last year, is because the district wanted to attach Appointive Faculty Evaluation Plan to the issue of Salary Inversion. This is why salary and compensation should not be tied to the RFP ratification. The district is going to say, "okay, we will address salary inversion for faculty hired before 2008, but ONLY if you agree to the elimination of tenure." And, you know what? You will do it. You will accept that offer, and consider it a victory, without giving little thought to what you are doing. Hundreds of faculty will see no relief from the outrage of salary inversion, but ALL of them will lose tenure. I have no doubt that the resistance and fight you received after last year's Probationary Faculty Evaluation Plan proposal will pale in comparison, but at the end of the day, that RFP will be ratified, because you only allow members of the Faculty Association to vote. If you allowed ALL faculty to vote, last year's RFP never would have passed. Many faculty, like me, were once faithful members of the FA who thought their dues were doing toward the protection of their rights. Instead, we watched our rights evaporate without a fight, and saw our dues go to paying for a new office building for the FA leadership. That's when we all had enough. So, we will have no say in these very issues that affect our lives and the lives of our families.
131	Doing a great job. Keep up the excellent communications!	122	communicate better